# ORIGINAL NEW APPLICATION



### BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

1	DEFORE THE ARIZONA	CORTORATION COMMISSION
2	COMMISSIONERS	AZ C DO 2018
3	TOM FORESE - Chairman	SEP SEP
4	BOB BURNS ANDY TOBIN	- CEIV
5	BOYD DUNN JUSTIN OLSON	NTRO
6	In the matter of:	DOCKET NO. S-21054A-18-03047
7	TITAN FUNDING GROUP I, LLC, an	NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY FOR HEARING
8	Arizona limited liability company,	REGARDING PROPOSED ORDER TO CEASE AND DESIST, ORDER FOR RESTITUTION,
9	TITAN CAPITAL REAL ESTATE FUND I, ) LLC, an Arizona limited liability company	ORDER FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PENALTIES, AND ORDER FOR OTHER
10	TITAN CAPITAL HOLDINGS LLC, a	AFFIRMATIVE ACTION
11	Nevada limited liability company,	Arizona Corporation Commission  DOCKETED
12	ADAM W. CHILD and ERIN M. CHILD, husband and wife,	SEP 11 2018
13	RODERICK R. RICKERT, a single man,	DOCKEJED BY
14	Respondents.	**************************************
15	NOTICE: EACH RESPONDENT	HAS 10 DAYS TO REQUEST A HEARING
16	HOTICE. EACH RESIGNMENT	HAS IN DATE TO REQUEST A HEARING

# EACH RESPONDENT HAS 30 DAYS TO FILE AN ANSWER

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

The Securities Division ("Division") of the Arizona Corporation Commission ("Commission") alleges that respondents Titan Funding Group I, LLC ("TFG"), Titan Capital Real Estate Fund I, LLC ("TCREF"), Titan Capital Holdings LLC ("Titan Capital"), Adam Child, and Roderick Rickert (collectively, "Respondents") have engaged in acts, practices, and transactions that constitute violations of the Securities Act of Arizona, A.R.S. § 44-1801 et seq. ("Securities Act").

The Division also alleges that Rickert is a person controlling TFG, TCREF, and Titan Capital within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-1999(B), so that he is jointly and severally liable under A.R.S. § 44-1999(B) to the same extent as these entities for their violations of the antifraud provisions of the Securities Act.

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

21

20

22

24

25

26

The Division also alleges that Titan Capital is a person controlling TFG within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-1999(B), so that it is jointly and severally liable under A.R.S. § 44-1999(B) to the same extent as TFG for its violations of the antifraud provisions of the Securities Act.

I.

#### JURISDICTION

 The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article XV of the Arizona Constitution and the Securities Act.

II.

#### RESPONDENTS

- 2. Roderick R. Rickert is a single man who at all relevant times resided in Arizona.
- 3. Adam Child is a married man who at all relevant times resided in Arizona.
- 4. TFG was formed in Arizona on July 7, 2011, as a member-managed company with Titan Capital as the sole member-manager.
- 5. Titan Capital was formed in Nevada on September 8, 2010, and has been registered to do business in Arizona as a foreign entity since December 28, 2010. The original Articles of Organization filed with the Nevada Secretary of State and the corporate filings with the Commission list Rickert as the managing-member of Titan Capital.
- During the timeframe relevant to this Notice, Child was TFG's president. TFG lists
   Rickert and Child among the "key managers and employees" in materials given to the investors and offerees described below.
- TCREF is a Delaware limited liability company formed on September 4, 2013. It did not register as a foreign entity in Arizona.
- 8. In its operating agreement, TCREF states that it is managed by TCG Management LLC, also a Delaware company. Private placement memorandums for TCREF list Child and Rickert among its key managers and employees. TCREF's marketing materials describe TCREF's executive team, with

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Rickert as the CEO and Child as the President. In its private placement memorandum, TCREF says that Titan Capital will originate loans on behalf of TCREF.

- 9. Erin Child ("Respondent Spouse") is an Arizona resident and has been the spouse of Adam Child since 2012. Respondent Spouse is joined in this action under A.R S. § 44-2031(C) solely for purposes of determining the liability of the marital communities.
- 10. From 2012 through 2015, Respondent Adam Child was acting for his own benefit and for the benefit or in furtherance of his marital community.

#### III.

#### **FACTS**

- 11. In 2010, Rickert operated a business that assisted people in buying foreclosure properties. Doing business as "INFOclosure," Rickert's company produced software that listed distressed properties being sold at foreclosure auctions. INFOclosure also assisted with purchasing the properties at auction.
- In late 2010, Rickert created Titan Capital to make hard-money loans—i.e. loans of typically less than 24 months with relatively higher interest rates—to purchasers of real property, including foreclosure properties. The typical borrower would use the funds to "fix-and-flip" a property, i.e. purchase a foreclosed, bank-owned or short-sale, single-family property, perform maintenance and reconstruction, then sell the property. Titan Capital would secure its loan to these borrowers with a mortgage or deed of trust recorded on the property. Titan Capital hired Adam Child to be its president in early 2011 to operate this lending business.
- 13. In 2013, Rickert and Child created TFG and TCREF to raise funds for Titan Capital's lending operations. TFG and TCREF would obtain funds from investors, pool those funds, then transfer funds to Titan Capital. Titan Capital would make loans to persons to purchase properties to "fix-andflip" and Titan Capital held a first-position lien on such property. Titan Capital also lent money to persons to perform construction on the properties where Titan Capital held a first-position lien. The construction loan would be secured by a second-position lien.

- 14. Titan Capital would charge the borrowers an interest rate between 12% and 18%. It would make its profits on the spread between this interest rate and the 10 11% that TCREF/TFG had to pay to investors.
- 15. Titan Capital would receive a deed of trust securing the loan. Titan Capital was then to enter a pledge agreement with TCREF/TFG where Titan Capital would assign its beneficial interest in the deed of trust to TCREF or TFG.
- Beginning in February 2013, TFG began seeking investors and offering notes to potential investors.
- 17. From February 2013 through September 2015, TFG sold notes to at least 25 persons for a total of at least \$2,757,429. The notes were to accrue interest at either 10% or 11% per annum. TFG would pay the investor monthly interest payments for four years then a balloon payment on the maturity date. These investors have received returns totaling approximately \$463,977.
- Beginning in October 2013, TCREF began seeking investors and offering limited liability company membership interests to potential investors.
- 19. From October 2013 through September 2015, TCREF sold limited liability company membership interests to at least eight persons for a total of at least \$3,697,000. TCREF represented to investors that TCREF would make annual distributions to investors from TCREF revenues that would equal 10% of the amount invested by each respective investor. The TCREF investors have received returns totaling approximately \$450,147.
- 20. TFG and TCREF found these offerees and investors by emailing potential investors on customer lists purchased from marketing firms, holding seminars, contacting existing acquaintances, obtaining referrals from existing investors, and by contacting customers of Child's and Rickert's other businesses.
- Child personally offered notes and membership interests to at least 20 of the TFG and TCREF investors.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

22. Rickert personally offered notes and membership interests to at least 10 of the TFG and TCREF investors.

## Misrepresentations and omissions regarding use of investor funds

- 23. TFG and TCREF funds were transferred to Titan Capital. Titan Capital then commingled those funds with its capital and capital from related entities. When Titan Capital failed in October 2015, TFG and TCREF failed too, resulting in investors losing almost the entire amount invested. In February 2016, Rickert caused the Titan Capital and its related entities to go into voluntary receivership. After a few months of the receiver locating assets and reviewing records, it was revealed that Titan Capital's operations differed significantly from representations made to TFG/TCREF investors: it had transferred only a portion of its funds to escrow/title companies, owned few significant real property and deed of trust assets, had made large transfers to Rickert-controlled entities, and may have been insolvent almost from its inception.
- 24. TCREF and TFG had represented to investors and offerees that their funds would be used by Titan Capital to fund hard money loans to borrowers who purchase, rehab, and sell residential properties; Titan Capital's loan would be secured by a deed of trust that would be pledged to TCREF and TFG.
- 25. Through representations by TFG/TCREF and their employees, several investors understood that their funds would only go towards loans and that TFG/TCREF and Titan Capital would pay for operational expenses with revenues from the interest charged to borrowers.
- 26. In TFG's private placement memorandum, which several investors received, TFG estimated that 100% of funds raised from investors would go to investment, with \$0 going to the company's operational expenses.
- 27. TFG's private placement memorandum also describes in detail its lending operations i.e. transferring money to Titan Capital to loan to borrowers—then states that investor funds would be used to expand the existing loan program.

- 28. TCREF further represented to several investors that Titan Capital was a licensed mortgage broker in Arizona and Nevada and was pursuing similar licensing in California.
- 29. TCREF and TFG described mortgage broker activities when they represented in their PPMs that Titan Capital would pledge 100% of its interest in pools of loans, deeds of trust, mortgages and similar interests that originated from Titan Capital's financing activities. This would secure TCREF's and TFG's obligations to their investors. A copy of the pledge agreement was included in TCREF's and TFG's private placement memorandums.
- 30. Under A.R.S. § 6-906(c), mortgage brokers "shall immediately deposit all monies received by the mortgage broker in an escrow account with an escrow agent licensed pursuant to [A.R.S. Title 6, Chapter 7]. Withdrawals shall only be disbursed according to the terms of the escrow instructions. The escrow agent shall not be the mortgage broker." The same statute requires that mortgage brokers not commingle their appraisal and credit investigation fees with the broker's other monies.
- 31. From 2013 through 2015, TFG and TCREF received approximately \$6,454,429 from investors.
- 32. These funds were commingled with funds from Titan Capital, including approximately \$12.2 million of capital that was to go to Titan Capital's primary business: making hard-money loans to borrowers who purchase, rehab, and sell residential properties.
- 33. Of the approximately \$18.6 million of Titan Capital's funds that should have gone to lending, Titan Capital only transferred approximately \$8.8 million to escrow and title companies. Titan received only approximately \$6.8 million from the title/escrow companies in return—far less than the principal amount transferred.
- 34. During 2013 2015, Titan Capital made several transfers that were not for funding loans to borrowers:
- a) A net of approximately \$1.4 million to Rickert's entity, Infoclosure, and other
   Rickert-controlled entities;

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26
- b) Approximately \$4.5 million to pay an equity fund that had lent money to Titan Capital;
- c) Approximately \$4.7 million for probable business expenses of Titan Capital and other related or Rickert-controlled entities;
- d) Approximately \$1.9 million to a condominium development in Flagstaff managed by one of Titan Capital's and TCREF's major investors;
- e) Approximately \$1.5 million to Titan Capital Management, an entity controlled by Rickert and Child through which they were to obtain payment;
- Approximately \$223,000 for Child's expenses including child support payments and payments to the IRS; and
  - Approximately \$191,000 for Rickert's expenses. g)
- 35. Because of these various transfers and failure to conduct its business as represented, Titan Capital's assets were insufficient to pay even a fraction of the amount owed to TFG/TCREF investors. In 2015, Titan Capital, TFG, TCREF and other related entities filed for receivership. The receiver's reports show that in May 2016, Titan Capital's assets consisted of four properties that the receiver sold for \$62,703 of net proceeds; interests in 10 performing loans producing monthly income of \$1,793; interests in four loans in default; five contracts for deeds of trust; ownership of two deeds of trust; and a construction loan that later netted \$32,865 for the receiver. In two years of managing the receivership, identifying and liquidating the entities' assets, the receiver was only able to collect a total of \$234,191.64.

### Omissions relevant to Adam Child's qualifications

36. In TFG and TCREF private placement memorandums and offering materials, Respondents represented that a key officer, Adam Child, was a competent manager with a proven track record of success in real estate financing.

- 37. Respondents omitted material information that would allow investors to evaluate Respondents' claims of Child's past success, the claims of Respondents' ability to generate returns, and Child's ability to manage a company that would generate these returns. These omissions include:
- a) On June 8, 2009, the Coconino County Superior Court entered judgment against Child for \$2,957,227 which includes \$1,956,000 treble damages for fraud and racketeering committed by Child in a real estate development enterprise near Flagstaff, Arizona.
- b) In 2009, Child filed for bankruptcy protection. In his bankruptcy, Child sought to discharge the judgment described above along with \$2,800,004 of unsecured claims which included \$263,945 of credit card debt, several deficiencies on foreclosed properties totaling over \$405,000, unpaid office rent, unpaid HOA fees, a \$40,000 deficiency on an automobile lease, and a \$570,000 personal loan. Child's bankruptcy schedules also list \$130,000 of unpaid taxes and \$60,000 of unpaid child and spousal support.
- c) On December 3, 2008, the Department of Financial Institutions found that through statements made by Child, Child's company, Child Mortgage Corporation, violated A.R.S. § 6-909(L) (making a false promise or misrepresentation or conceal an essential or material fact in the course of the mortgage broker business), § 6-909(M) (failure to truthfully account for the monies belonging to a party to a mortgage loan transaction or failure to disburse monies in accordance with his agreements) and § 6-909(N) (engaging in illegal or improper business practices). In a consent order signed by Child, DFI revoked the entity's mortgage broker license and ordered payment of a \$2,705 penalty.

IV.

### VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1841

### (Offer or Sale of Unregistered Securities)

38. From on or about February 2013 through 2015, Respondents offered or sold securities in the form of investment contracts and notes, within or from Arizona.

- 1			
1	39. The securities referred to above were not registered pursuant to Articles 6 or 7 of the		
2	Securities Act.		
3	40. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1841.		
4	V.		
5	VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1842		
6	(Transactions by Unregistered Dealers or Salesmen)		
7	41. Respondents offered or sold securities within or from Arizona while not registered as		
8	dealers or salesmen pursuant to Article 9 of the Securities Act.		
9	42. This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1842.		
10	VI.		
11	VIOLATION OF A.R.S. § 44-1991		
12	(Fraud in Connection with the Offer or Sale of Securities)		
13	43. In connection with the offer or sale of securities within or from Arizona, Respondents		
14	directly or indirectly: (i) employed a device, scheme, or artifice to defraud; (ii) made untrue statement		
15	of material fact or omitted to state material facts that were necessary in order to make the statement		
16	made not misleading in light of the circumstances under which they were made; or (iii) engaged in		
17	transactions, practices, or courses of business that operated or would operate as a fraud or deceit upon		
18	offerees and investors. Respondents' conduct includes, but is not limited to, the following:		
19	a) Representing to TFG and TCREF investors that their funds would be transferred		
20	to Titan Capital, a mortgage broker, where it would be used to lend money for real estate projects when		
21	in fact Titan Capital commingled these investors' funds with funds from other operations, then		
22	transferred only a portion of the commingled funds to escrow agents and to real estate projects.		
23	b) Representing to TFG and TCREF investors that Titan Capital would pledge its		
24	liens on real property to secure payment of TFG and TCREF investments when in fact Titan Capital had		
25	insufficient assets to secure payment of even a fraction of the TFG/TCREF investments.		
26			

Representing to TFG and TCREF investors that Child, a top Titan Capital

executive, had success in the real estate lending industry without disclosing to several investors

information that would be material to assessing the accuracy of these representations, namely: Child's

past lawsuit in Coconino County, his bankruptcy, and his entity's loss of its mortgage broker license;

5	44.	This conduct violates A.R.S. § 44-1991.	
6		VII.	
7		CONTROL PERSON LIABILITY PURSUANT TO A.R.S. § 44-1999	
8	45.	From at least 2011 through 2015, Rickert directly or indirectly controlled Titan	
9	Capital, TFG	and TCREF within the meaning of A.R.S. § 44-1999. Therefore, Rickert is jointly and	
10	severally liable to the same extent as these entities for their violations of A.R.S. § 44-1991.		
11	46.	From at least 2011 through 2015, Titan Capital directly or indirectly controlled TFG	
12	within the mo	eaning of A.R.S. § 44-1999. Therefore, Titan Capital is jointly and severally liable to	
13	the same extent as TFG for its violations of A.R.S. § 44-1991.		
14		VIII.	
15		REQUESTED RELIEF	
16	The D	Division requests that the Commission grant the following relief:	
17	1.	Order Respondents to permanently cease and desist from violating the Securities Act,	
18	pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2032;		
19	2.	Order Respondents to take affirmative action to correct the conditions resulting from	
20	Respondents' acts, practices, or transactions, including a requirement to make restitution pursuant to		
21	A.R.S. § 44-2032;		
22	3.	Order Respondents to pay the state of Arizona administrative penalties of up to \$5,000	
23	for each violation of the Securities Act, pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-2036;		
24	4.	Order that the marital community of Respondent Child and Respondent Spouse be	
25	subject to any order of restitution, rescission, administrative penalties, or other appropriate affirmative		
26	action pursuant to A.R.S. § 25-215; and		

1

2

3

4

c)

5. Order any other relief that the Commission deems appropriate.

#### 

## 

## 

## 

# 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

## 

### 

#### 

### 

## 

## 

#### IX.

#### HEARING OPPORTUNITY

Each Respondent including Respondent Spouse may request a hearing pursuant to A.R.S. § 44-1972 and A.A.C. R14-4-306. **If a Respondent or Respondent Spouse requests a hearing, the requesting Respondent must also answer this Notice.** A request for hearing must be in writing and received by the Commission within 10 business days after service of this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing. The requesting Respondent must deliver or mail the request to Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602)542-3477 or on the Commission's website at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

If a request for a hearing is timely made, the Commission shall schedule the hearing to begin 20 to 60 days from the receipt of the request unless otherwise provided by law, stipulated by the parties, or ordered by the Commission. If a request for a hearing is not timely made the Commission may, without a hearing, enter an order granting the relief requested by the Division in this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing.

Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation such as a sign language interpreter, as well as request this document in an alternative format, by contacting Kacie Cannon, ADA Coordinator, voice phone number (602) 542-3931, e-mail <a href="mailto:kcannon@azcc.gov">kcannon@azcc.gov</a>. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation. Additional information about the administrative action procedure may be found at <a href="http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/securities/enforcement/AdministrativeProcedure.asp">http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/securities/enforcement/AdministrativeProcedure.asp</a>

X.

#### ANSWER REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-305, if a Respondent or Respondent Spouse requests a hearing, the requesting Respondent must deliver or mail an Answer to this Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to

Docket Control, Arizona Corporation Commission, 1200 W. Washington, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, within 30 calendar days after the date of service of this Notice. Filing instructions may be obtained from Docket Control by calling (602)542-3477 or on the Commission's website at http://www.azcc.gov/divisions/hearings/docket.asp.

Additionally, the answering Respondent must serve the Answer upon the Division. Pursuant to A.A.C. R14-4-303, service upon the Division may be made by mailing or by hand-delivering a copy of the Answer to the Division at 1300 West Washington, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Phoenix, Arizona, 85007, addressed to Ryan Millecam.

The Answer shall contain an admission or denial of each allegation in this Notice and the original signature of the answering respondent or respondent's attorney. A statement of a lack of sufficient knowledge or information shall be considered a denial of an allegation. An allegation not denied shall be considered admitted.

When the answering Respondent intends in good faith to deny only a part or a qualification of an allegation, the Respondent shall specify that part or qualification of the allegation and shall admit the remainder. The answering Respondent waives any affirmative defense not raised in the Answer.

The officer presiding over the hearing may grant relief from the requirement to file an Answer for good cause shown.

Dated this 11th day of September 2018.

Mark Dinell

Interim Director of Securities